



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,890	02/20/2004	Ashish A. Pandya	2103110-991180	7628

26379 7590 01/12/2007
DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HANH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,890

Applicant(s)

PANDYA, ASHISH A.

Examiner

Hanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 10/23/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 27 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 27 and 62, the amended "hardware processor accelerating a protocol processing stack" is not disclosed in page 25 of the specification, as pointed out in the response by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-50 and 52-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent 7,047,561 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 26, 28, 31, 34, 40, 45, 50, 52, 55 and 58, Lee teaches a security network system (see figures 1, firewall 100 restricts access to/from IP network 110

Art Unit: 2616

against one or more security policies) comprising one or more network systems of one or more types (see fig.1, external IP network 120 and Internal Ip network 110). The firewall 100 comprises packet filter 106 (hardware processor) that examine packets at layer-3; layer-4 (providing multiple layer security; see col.4, lines 15-45); and pass the data payload to application layer (providing transport layer protocol processing, col.4, lines 55-60). The packet filter 106 (hardware processor) follows predetermined security rules that specify which types of packets are allowed to pass and which types of packets are blocked (see col.4, lines 40-55; analyzing network traffic for rule matching; classifying packets and take actions). Lee further discloses DMA controller 208 located in firewall 200 (see fig.4; remote direct memory access for data transfer; col.8, lines 4-10); and RAM 206 (storage area network for one or more network system). See col. 8, lines 4-10.

*Regarding claims 27 and 62, it is not claimed that “a security system for a network” providing multiple protocol layer security. With the discussion of claim 1 above, Lee discloses a security system providing operating environment for trusted computing needs of one or more networks in fig.1(see col.4, lines 23-28; restricting access to/from IP network 110 to one central point where all incoming and outgoing traffic are examined against security policies). Lee further discloses a central manager for compiling the rules and monitoring the rules (see fig.1,see col.5, lines 30-50; control logic 104 specifies what Ip addresses to be passes and rejected; what particular applications, type of traffics to be enabled and serviced by the firewall; and applies security policy). Lee discloses NAT 108 providing protocol stacks at layers 3 and 4 (providing a protocol processing stack; see col.5, lines 10-20).

Claims 3-8, 11-25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35-39, 41-44, 46-49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59-61 are rejected because of their dependent on independent claims 1, 2, 9, 26, 28, 31, 34, 40, 45, 50-52, 55, 58 and 62.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent 7,047,561 B1) in view of Kametani (Us Pat. 6,839,346 B1).

In claim 51, Lee has disclosed most of limitations in claim 1. Lee does not disclose a security processing engine performing encryption, decryption, authorization or authentication. Kametani discloses, in fig.2, a security process including a security processing section 19. The security section 19 is instructed to encrypt, decrypt packets (security processing engine performing encryption, decryption; see col.8, lines 40-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to use the encrypt /decrypt method of Kametani into Lee in order to transmit confidential information to receiver.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shah et al. (US pat. 7,024,479 B2);


Kunzinger (US pat. 6,986,061 B1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 4:30. The examiner can also be reached on alternate

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Nguyen



**HANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**